

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the present application. The specification and drawings were objected to for containing the attorney's docket number. Claims 6 and 7 were objected to because of insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the routing table." Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. in view of Anderson et al. Claims 3-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black, and further in view of Anderson and Global Engineering ("Fibre Channel Arbitrated Loop" from IDS).

Claims 1, 3, and 6-8 have been amended. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed concurrently herewith. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application in view of the amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The specification and drawings were objected to for containing the attorney's docket number. This objection is respectfully traversed. Identifying information is routinely included on the specification and drawings without objection by the U.S. Patent Office. In fact, identification information such as the attorney's docket number is encouraged *by rule* on the drawings: "*Identification of drawings.* Identifying indicia should be provided, and if provided, should include the . . . *docket number* (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application." (37 C.F.R. §1.84(c), emphasis added.) At the time the drawings were filed, no application number had been assigned, so a docket number was provided. Accordingly, the objection to the specification and drawings is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 7 were objected to because of insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the routing table."

Amended claim 6 now recites "a routing table" instead of "the routing table." With this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claim 6 has been overcome.

The objection to claim 7 is respectfully traversed. Claim 7 recites “a route determination apparatus comprising a routing table, the routing table initialized with a device discovery process during loop initialization.” Therefore, claim 7 has sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the routing table.” It is respectfully submitted that the objection to claim 7 has been overcome.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black in view of Anderson. Claim 1 has been amended. With the amendments to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The present invention is directed to a new method and apparatus for switching Fibre Channel Arbitrated Loop systems between a plurality of Fibre Channel Arbitrated Loop devices. One feature of the present invention is that the route determination apparatus (router) is directly coupled to the plurality of ports and the connectivity apparatus (crossbar switch). In particular, amended claim 1 recites “route determination apparatus *directly coupled* to each port and the crossbar switch *through separate signaling paths . . .*” (Emphasis added.)

Black fails to disclose, teach or suggest “route determination apparatus *directly coupled* to each port and the crossbar switch *through separate signaling paths*” as recited in amended claim 1. As shown in Figure 4 of Black, the routing table 127 is not directly coupled to the ports 102 and crossbar switch 100 through separate signaling paths. Rather, the routing table 127 is coupled to the ports 102 *through a protocol bus* 121 (see col. 14 lines 29-31 of Black), and is only *indirectly coupled to the crossbar switch* 100 through the ports 102. In other words, there are no separate signaling paths between the routing table 127 and the ports 102 and crossbar switch 100 in Black.

Anderson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Black because Anderson contains no disclosure at all related to “route determination apparatus *directly coupled* to each port and the crossbar switch *through separate signaling paths*.” In fact, Anderson is completely silent as to any *route determination apparatus* whatsoever.

Because neither Black nor Anderson, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of this claim

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black, in view of Anderson, has been overcome. In addition, because claim 2 depends from claim 1, the rejection of this claim has been overcome for the same reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black, and further in view of Anderson, and Global Engineering. Claims 3 and 6-8 have been amended. With the amendments to claims 3 and 6-8, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been overcome.

In particular, amended claim 3 recites “route determination apparatus *directly coupled* to the first and second ports” and “connectivity apparatus *directly coupled* to . . . the route determination apparatus.” Amended claim 6 recites “route determination logic *directly coupled* to the port logic and the connectivity apparatus.” Amended claim 7 recites “wherein the route determination apparatus is *directly coupled* to the plurality of ports and the crossbar switch.” Amended claim 8 recites “wherein the route determination apparatus is *directly coupled* to the plurality of ports and the connectivity apparatus.” As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2, neither Black nor Anderson discloses, teaches or suggests these limitations. Further, Global Engineering fails to make up for the deficiencies of Black and Anderson, because Global Engineering also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest these limitations.

Because neither Black nor Anderson nor Global Engineering, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests all of the limitations of claims 3 and 6-8, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Black, and further in view of Anderson, and Global Engineering has been traversed. In addition, because claims 4, 5, 9-14 depend from claims 3 and 6-8, the rejection of these claims has been overcome for the same reasons as provided above with respect to claims 3 and 6-8.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5752 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 491442011600.

Dated: February 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Glenn M. Kubota/
Glenn M. Kubota
Registration No.: 44,197
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street
Los Angeles, California 90013-1024
(213) 892-5752